

**U.S. Department of Education - EDCAPS  
G5-Technical Review Form (New)**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/01/2017 05:54 PM

## Technical Review

**Applicant:** NYC Dept. of Education Community School Dist 21 (U351C170014)

**Reader #1:** \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Need for Project</b>		
1. Need for Project	10	10
<b>Quality of Project Services</b>		
1. Project Services	25	25
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	15	15
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	19
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	28
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Leveraging Technology</b>		
1. CPP 1	5	5
<b>Total</b>	105	102

# Technical Review Form

**Panel #2 - Professional Development for Arts Educators - 2: 84.351C**

**Reader #1:** \*\*\*\*\*

**Applicant:** NYC Dept. of Education Community School Dist 21 (U351C170014)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project. In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project will focus on serving or otherwise addressing the needs of disadvantaged individuals.

(2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

#### Strengths:

1. The proposed project cites statistics relevant to the general U.S. and NYC population regarding the educational challenges of English Language Learners (e21). Research is cited regarding the need for language learning support via increased academic engagement in the arts and humanities (e21-23).
2. The district has engaged in a two-year needs assessment process specifically focused on the needs of EL students (e23). This needs assessment encompasses the needs of ELs who are at differing levels of English proficiency. The district has pinpointed the needs for arts education within the regular school day as an area of focus for the proposed project (e24) and has also identified the support of EL students as a state mandate that does not include professional development for arts educators (e24). The proposed project identifies the need to support students' development of digital literacies (e25).

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 10

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project. In determining the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project, the Secretary considers the quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

(2) The likely impact of the services to be provided by the proposed project on the intended recipients of those services.

(3) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.

**Strengths:**

1. The proposal effectively and comprehensively communicates the relationship between current research knowledge and practices and the services provided through the project. Current and relevant research citations relate to areas that include, but are not limited to: professional development communities (e28), experiential and kinesthetic learning (e29), contextualized English Language Learning curricula (e29), authentic problem-solving opportunities (e29), apprenticeship models of learning (e30), and the co-construction of linguistic knowledge (e30).
2. The impact of the proposed services on ENL, humanities, and visual arts teachers and their students is likely to be significant due to a number of factors. For teachers, these factors include but are not limited to: the foundation of the project on previous grant-funded professional development projects, all with high-quality evaluation components (e61), a multi-layered professional development process culminating in the development of eportfolios to document lessons and assessments (e32-33), an existing professional development partnership and accompanying infrastructure (e27), DDLC Arts Learning Labs and Conferences, and the creation of a public-facing website resource for teachers within and outside of the project (e43-44).

For students, these factors include the use of student learning communities (e27), a scaffolded approach to assisting students in demonstrating arts-based knowledge and increased language proficiency (e35), and opportunities to display language competencies, critical thinking skills, and collaboration via both written and oral communication about art-based classroom work (e36).

3. The proposed project describes professional development that is of very high quality. This is first exemplified by the scaffolded use of eportfolios to document teachers' emerging assessment literacy (e32). The development of assessment literacy takes professional development beyond showing teachers how to do rigorous assessment of student learning to empowering teachers with the knowledge necessary to become mentors for other teachers, should the opportunity arise. The proposed project will provide professional development of significant intensity, given weekly professional development meetings with program managers on the steady development of curricula that integrates arts for middle school students. The use of an existing, district-adopted framework for documenting teachers' competencies (e32), and the connection of teachers with teaching artists via a long time arts partner that is also a state-approved sponsor of Continuing Teacher and Leader Education (CTLE) (e19, 23) are additional strengths that contribute to the quality of the professional development approach.

**Weaknesses:**

1. No weaknesses noted.
2. No weaknesses noted.
3. No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 25**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel**

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**(1) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

**(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of project consultants or subcontractors.**

**Strengths:**

1. The co-directors of the projects are both highly qualified. The Principal Leadership Facilitator for Community School District 21 has over 35 years of relevant experience, with many of those years being directly in supervisory positions (e50). The Director of Professional Development has a wealth of experience directly related to the proposed

project, based on her co-direction of three previous PDAE projects, as well as consulting work and current publications in areas consistent with the focus of the project (e51). The project evaluator is also highly qualified, given over 13 years of evaluation work with ArtsConnection, and successful evaluations of other PDAE projects (e54).

2. The project managers and program managers are each highly qualified, due in large part to their past and current professional development work in ArtsConnection (e51-54). A further strength is the availability of additional staff that can be provided by the project evaluator, on an as-needed basis (e54).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

This criterion was thoroughly discussed and my score reflects my personal assessment of this section.

**Reader's Score: 15**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(2) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

(3) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

**Strengths:**

1. The management plan for the proposed project is grounded by specific milestones for work and evaluation of both teachers' and students' eportfolios (e55-59). A specific strength of the management plan is a distinct and effective division of milestones related to teachers' pedagogical knowledge and their knowledge of assessment via eportfolios (e57). These two components are a clear thread throughout the management plan.

2. A continuous improvement cycle is actualized in the proposed project through monthly meetings of the Digital DELTA team. The results of these meetings are then shared with teachers and others at each school site (e60). Program managers and principals form smaller school-based teams that help ensure the project's goals and objectives are met (e60). A further strength is the monthly meetings held between the Project Evaluator and key staff to help support fidelity of implementation, an on-time management process, and a well-managed budget process (e61).

3. The project directors both allocate 50% of their time to the proposed project. This is appropriate, given the depth of involvement through the project manager, the program managers, principals at each school, and the project evaluator.

**Weaknesses:**

1. Information about job responsibilities related specifically to what is involved in program managers' facilitation work should be provided in greater detail (e60, e61), given that facilitation can range from basic oversight to a more embedded and comprehensive support and involvement. Similarly, inclusion of details regarding the technological and PR support provided by program managers would strengthen the proposal.

2. No weaknesses noted.

3. No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 19**

## Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory (as defined in this notice).

### Strengths:

1. The proposed evaluation is a finely tuned, comprehensive evaluation and assessment plan. The evaluation plan includes an Impact Study that is consistent with What Works Clearinghouse evidence standards (e62). The Impact Study is clearly linked with program outcomes for both teachers and students. An additional strength of the evaluation is the collection of baseline data during the first year of the grant (e65). The use of NVivo as a means for both cataloging and analyzing qualitative data is a further strength of the evaluation (e67).

2. Elements of the project management plan provide key supports for feedback and periodic assessment that is given to school leaders and project staff. An additional strength is the use of the proprietary ArtsResearch data collection and analysis software platform as a means of facilitating expected progress toward project objectives and outcomes. (e67)

3. The proposed project is supported by a very strong and coherent logic model (e74).

### Weaknesses:

1. The use of a matched sample in the Impact Study is a highly rigorous approach. However, based on information provided, it is unclear what steps will be taken if there are not enough treatment teachers for the matched sample. Given the longstanding arts-based professional development that has taken place within the district, providing a description of strategies that could be used to mitigate this challenge would strengthen the evaluation plan (e65).

2. It is unclear why the milestones related to teachers' involvement are sometimes set at a relatively low level, compared to other milestones (50% vs. 75%). If teacher attrition or involvement is a factor in these differentiated milestones, the proposal would be improved by including formative data collection that would follow up with teachers who are not as involved as originally anticipated (e61).

3. No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 28

## Priority Questions

### Competitive Preference Priority - Leveraging Technology

1. Projects that are designed to leverage technology through one or more of the following:

(a) Using high-speed Internet access and devices to increase students' and educators' access to high-quality accessible digital tools, assessments, and materials, particularly open educational resources.

(b) Implementing high-quality, accessible online courses, online learning communities, or online simulations, such as those for which educators could earn professional development credit or continuing education units through digital credentials based on demonstrated mastery of competencies and performance-based outcomes, instead of traditional time-based metrics.

**Strengths:**

- a. The proposed project will create high-quality digital tools for English Learners (ELs) (e19) as well as a public facing Digital DELTA website comprised of language objectives, formative assessment protocols and student work (e48).
- b. A blended model of professional development that also assists teachers in meeting Continuing Teacher and Leader Education certification will be provided through ArtsConnection, a recognized provider of professional development (e19). This model will use Lens on Language, an established professional development curriculum, as a means to provide online education that complements teachers' face-to-face work (e52).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:**      5

---

**Status:**               Submitted  
**Last Updated:**      08/01/2017 05:54 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/02/2017 11:02 AM

## Technical Review

**Applicant:** NYC Dept. of Education Community School Dist 21 (U351C170014)

**Reader #2:** \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Need for Project</b>		
1. Need for Project	10	10
<b>Quality of Project Services</b>		
1. Project Services	25	25
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	15	14
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	17
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	29
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Leveraging Technology</b>		
1. CPP 1	5	5
<b>Total</b>	105	100



# Technical Review Form

## Panel #2 - Professional Development for Arts Educators - 2: 84.351C

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: NYC Dept. of Education Community School Dist 21 (U351C170014)

### Questions

#### Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project. In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project will focus on serving or otherwise addressing the needs of disadvantaged individuals.

(2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

#### Strengths:

1. The applicant describes a well-developed program structured to focus on serving the needs of disadvantaged individuals identified as English Language Learners. Specific groups of students to be served include: those who are new to the USA in the last two years; students with interrupted education, students with disabilities and students who are long term English Language Learners who have received six year of language support and remain in need of support and education. Page e21

The applicant references research noting that English Language Learners who experience needs are more likely to be retained more often than their peers and have most difficulty in graduation in four years from high school. Page e21

The applicant articulates nationwide and state and local data to clearly narrate the needs of English Language Learners. It is noted that students who experience course failure also demonstrate low attendance rates. The applicant is focused on serving students in middle grades and is engaging parents and partners in their endeavor. The applicant notes the ArtsConnection as a nation organization to whom they are turning for support and assistance. This organization has developed Digital DELTA with support from and AEMDD grant in 2011 and that this PDAE grant program will build on that prior success. Pages e22-29

2. The applicant precisely identifies the specific gaps in services, infrastructure, and opportunities which ELL students are in need of a program structure to concisely address their needs. The nature and magnitude of gaps are well defined. It is specified that at the state level the needs are recognized and mandates are issued to address the meet issued. However little support is provided by the state and city to support staff professional development to enable educators to develop strategies to address students' needs. The identified partner ArtsConnection is identified as a state approved sponsor and can provide professional development which is applicable and will count toward the required 100 hours of professional development acceptable for CTLE credits that must be competed in five years. Pages e24-25

It is noted that while some progress has been made in the idle schools in the district using technology and digital media over the last few year, and that an infrastructure is lacking to support the specific participatory learning possible through digital technologies. Page e25

The applicant identifies the Danielson Framework Domain Professional Responsibilities to serve to encourage project teachers to participate in a learning community focus on professional inquiry and contribute to addressing the needs in sharing lessons learned. The applicant clearly describes the Danielson model which is a three-year professional development model of intense work. Page e27

#### Weaknesses

**Weaknesses:**

None are noted.

**Reader's Score:** 10

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services**

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project. In determining the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project, the Secretary considers the quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**(1) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.**

**(2) The likely impact of the services to be provided by the proposed project on the intended recipients of those services.**

**(3) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant precisely references up to date knowledge to support the scope of services to be provided by the proposed project. It is specified that the goal of Digital DELTA Learning Communities initiative is built on shared knowledge and collaboration across the disciplines focused to improve instructional practices focused to support and encourage middle school youth working through English Language development. A focus is to engage students to think like arts and transfer those skills in language development and apply that knowledge in core content areas. Six middle schools are participating in the project working in and through two levels. The level one is Digital DELTA professional learning communities comprised of Arts, English language Literacy teacher, humanities teachers and collaborating with an ArtsConnection teacher artist and the program manager. The second level is the Digital DELTA student learning communities that participate in 25 sessions of dance or theater. The student learning communities serve as a lab for educators to expedient with various strategies in improving arts and language learning. Pages e27-28

The applicant references research studies which determine that performing arts and language arts are closely corresponded to student's achievement and mastery of vocabulary in an integrated manner. Additional research is referenced noting that the arts provide opportunities for self-expression and self-generated conversations. In addition, research is cited noting that students need to learn to learn. Page e29

2. The proposed program is well developed and structured to likely impact the learning and development of both educators and students. At the heart of the initiative is student achievement in the arts and in English Language Arts. The program's structure is focused to advance shared knowledge across disciplines to improve instructional strategies correlated to advance student learning. The program engages 48 arts instructors, English Language Literacy educators and humanities teachers collaborating to support and teach 750 middle school students per year. The program will offer staff services and students learning ventures and document practices. The major components of the program are well concisely described. These include: collaborative student ePortfolios, differentiated strands of professional development, and a blended learning model. It is noteworthy that a Lens and Language hybrid online and in person professional development course is focused on theory and classroom application of second language acquisition strategies. In addition, the Arts Learning Labs are aligned where the collaboratively designed arts curriculum is implemented and encompasses formative assessment strategies and support language development as an opportunity for students to put their ePortoflion into action. Pages e35-37

Three program objectives are identified and articulated as focused: to build the capacity of educators to integrate language arts support into arts standards focused to help students challenged with English language proficiencies;

expand meaningful assessment of arts and language arts and develop the use of technology as a tool to enable middle school English Language Learners to process arts mindsets and into learning across the curriculum. Pages e41-44

It is likely that the program will have a strong impact as it focuses both on teachers and on students. Student's opportunities will build arts and literacy skills over a three-year period. Instruction and technology serve as platforms to advance students metacognition, self-regulated learning, time management and goal setting while mastering arts and literacy standards. Educational technology focus in professional development puts teachers in the role of learners as they master new technology and advance to customize tools and engage in online learning and in person professional learning communities. Pages e45-47

3. The proposed program is concisely described to align professional development services for educators which are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services. Through on-going engagement, peer collaboration and a feedback loops, educators develop instructional approaches in repertoires of traditional and new venues for continuous improvement. The program is specified as aligned with state and national arts and language arts standard, and offer on line and in person training, attendance at conferences and meetings, and work with partners including ArtConection to expand institution and learning services for immediate audiences of students in their schools and to larger audiences through virtual learning and teaching classrooms. The four years of the program are well described. It is noteworthy that in year four, program dissemination will be initiated. The cultivation of three years of learning and working reaches a period in year four to upload lessons and share. The Digital DELTA website and Open Educational Resources Website will enable staff to engage students' ePortfolios and collect information, edit and revise tools and initiate online distribution. Page e50

**Weaknesses:**

None are noted.

**Reader's Score: 25**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel**

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**(1) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

**(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of project consultants or subcontractors.**

**Strengths:**

1. The applicant precisely details the qualifications of the Co-Project Directors and references their resumes for verification of qualifications. The person selected s one Co-Project Director is well qualified. He started his career as a teacher in New York and progressed through the ranks to a supervisory position and currently serves as the head of the Inquiry Team in the Community City School District 21. His service in working with English Language learners is noted as is his passion in the arts. The other Co-Project Director is also qualified for the position noting her position in ArtsConnections working with professional development programming and teacher training. It is of note that her experience encompasses co-directing three PDAE grant programs. Pages e48-50

Additional key personnel are identified and their qualifications detailed. For example, a Project Manager is identified who will serve to coordinate all aspects of the DELTA program and collaborate with the professional development and has served as a co-director and the director on grant programs. Her qualifications are noted as having worked with ArtsConnetion for ten years, with five years as a program manager in a middle school program. Page e51

2. The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of project consultants are clearly articulated. One consultant to serve as the Program Manager, she is an employee of ArtConnection and is experienced in working with middle school programs and has worked with the co-directors in prior programs. The Deputy Director for ArtConnection is identified as a consultant and his experiences in arts and in TESOL is clearly narrated. In addition, it is specified that six ArtConnection teaching artists will be chosen to serve as in the program to provide their expertise in various art forms and work with ESL young. An Educational Technology is noted to serve as a consultant with collaborative plans with ArtConnection and provides technical support. Pages e51-54

A program evaluator is identified as a person who currently serve the as the Associate Director of the Center for Arts Education at Teachers College, Columbia University. He will serve as the independent program evaluator. Page e54

### **Weaknesses:**

#### **Weaknesses**

Adequate information is lacking to address the criteria related to the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. Specifically, the applicant fails to address the first portion of the selection criterion: "In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability."

This criterion was thoroughly discussed and my score reflects my personal assessment of this section.

Question Status:Completed

**Reader's Score:** 14

### **Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**(1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

**(2) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**

**(3) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.**

### **Strengths:**

1. The applicant describes the history of successful grants management of ArtsConnection to serve to support the adequacy of the management plan noting clear milestones for each year of the program. The ArtsConnection has successfully managed five AEMDD grant programs and brings this experience to a new area. The applicant district supports their selection of ArtsConnection to co-direct the program and asserts confidence in their decision. ArtsConnection is responsible to commit 56 hours of professional development in the first three years of the program and 48 hours in the fourth year. The three program objectives are specified and milestones for each year aligned. For example, in the first objective, the focus is to build the capacity of educators to integrate language arts support into arts integration into the curriculum to assist English language Learners. The milestone for year one is articulated for an end of year conference to host each educator in sharing at least one language arts supported template. Page e58

2. The applicant describes that the propose program will be actively managed by a six-person team. The team is identified

to consist of: two Co-Project Directors, one Project Manager, and the applicant details the Program Manager's adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project. The team is scheduled to meet monthly to review program progress. The Program is specified to be managed against a timeline and Logic Model. It is the designated responsibility of the Program Manager to provide a built-in feedback loop by gathering key information for the team's decision making. And refinement of operations. The Program Manager is also responsible to facilitate communications with the school representatives, the project team and professional development activities at each school level. Pages e60-61

A Project Evaluator is identified as responsible to receive key feedback on the effectiveness of program operations and how the needs of students and staff are being met to inform the team. It is stated that the final year of the project is to focus on digital dissemination of project materials about the process used with teachers and students and to provide examples of student's works through ePortfolios. Page e61

3. The applicant provides some information in specifying the time commitments of the project co-directors, identifying that they will serve 50% in managing the project. The Project Manager is identified to serve full time and is responsible to coordinate professional development and monitor school team n provide documentation.

#### **Weaknesses:**

1. The applicant presents brief information which lacks a comprehensive response to the criteria. For example, information is lacking specifying detailing how and when it will achieve the objectives of the proposed project noting strategies to enable completion on time and within budget.
2. The applicant lacks a clear and comprehensive response to the criteria in identifying an adequate scope of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project. While it is stated for the Project Team to review data, information is lacking on time frame for collection, analysis and reporting.
3. The applicant fails to substantiate that the 50% time commitments of the co-project directors and other key project personnel is appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

**Reader's Score:** 17

#### **Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:**
  - (1) **The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.**
  - (2) **The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**
  - (3) **The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory (as defined in this notice).**

#### **Strengths:**

1. It is specified to conduct and Impact Study with a quasi-experimental design which meets What Works Clearinghouse standards. In addition, it is noted that an Implementation Study will be conducted and supplemented by a mixed method

investigation with quantitative and qualitative approaches to data collection and analysis. One objective is stated and adequate information aligned articulating a performance objective measures. For example, related to objective one, in year one a milestone is stated fir 50% of educators to identify and craft a language objective for an arts lesson, as measured by a series of teacher surveys which is built in. Page e62

2. The applicant describes an Implementation Study to be conducted by the team to measure the fidelity to the program. Three levels are stated to frame response and feedback and input focused on the students, the staff and the schools. Three well composed questions are well positioned to evoke responses to program fidelity. Page e68

3. The program is supported by research and a strong theory focus on building methods and educators' ability to integrate language arts support into arts instruction to improve language arts for English Language Learners. Page e69

### **Weaknesses:**

Information is lacking to describe any periodic feedback and to identify the audiences from which feedback will be sought.

Information is lacking to describe any periodic feedback and to identify the audiences from which feedback will be sought.

**Reader's Score: 29**

### **Priority Questions**

#### **Competitive Preference Priority - Leveraging Technology**

##### **1. Projects that are designed to leverage technology through one or more of the following:**

**(a) Using high-speed Internet access and devices to increase students' and educators' access to high-quality accessible digital tools, assessments, and materials, particularly open educational resources.**

**(b) Implementing high-quality, accessible online courses, online learning communities, or online simulations, such as those for which educators could earn professional development credit or continuing education units through digital credentials based on demonstrated mastery of competencies and performance-based outcomes, instead of traditional time-based metrics.**

### **Strengths:**

a. The project is described as leveraging technology to increase students' and educators' use of high-quality digital tools in two ways. It provides high-quality digital tools accessible to all students specifically English Language Learners advancing their learning through making artistic choices and building collaborative ePortfolios. These tools serve to advance students' articulation and assess and to improve their work in the arts.

b. This approach is a blended model of Professional Development that includes both face-to-face interaction with ArtsConnection's staff and online course material that allow educators to earn Professional Development credits to fulfill the mandates of 100 hours training all personnel who are not permanent certificate holders, including arts and humanities teacher; this mandate is asserted by the New York State Department of Education. The applicant is partnering with ArtsConnection to gain mastery of performance-based outcomes by developing their own Educator ePortfolio. The portfolios are scheduled to publish on the ArtsConnection website during the final year of the project to enable replication and assist other educators.

**Weaknesses:**

None are noted.

**Reader's Score:**     **5**

---

**Status:**           Submitted

**Last Updated:**    08/02/2017 11:02 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/31/2017 12:25 PM

## Technical Review

**Applicant:** NYC Dept. of Education Community School Dist 21 (U351C170014)

**Reader #3:** \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Need for Project</b>		
1. Need for Project	10	10
<b>Quality of Project Services</b>		
1. Project Services	25	25
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	15	15
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	19
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	29
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Leveraging Technology</b>		
1. CPP 1	5	5
<b>Total</b>	105	103



# Technical Review Form

## Panel #2 - Professional Development for Arts Educators - 2: 84.351C

Reader #3: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: NYC Dept. of Education Community School Dist 21 (U351C170014)

### Questions

#### Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project. In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project will focus on serving or otherwise addressing the needs of disadvantaged individuals.

(2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

#### Strengths:

(1)

The proposed project focuses on serving a NYC/Brooklyn district 21's middle school ELL population, who are predominantly challenged by not only language, but also being newcomers, living in poverty, interrupted formal education, and low graduation rates (e21) and their ENL, humanities and art teachers. (e22)

(2)

Challenges for educators include lack of arts knowledge and the concept of multiple literacies for ENL and humanities teachers, lack of digital understanding for all teachers, and lack of knowledge on using formative assessment to challenge student thinking. (e22-27)

Additional challenges for ELL students, such as infrastructure weaknesses in the education system, and an arts opportunity gap, segregation, a technology gap, and boredom, are detailed from pages e22-27.

A pragmatic challenge for middle school ELs is that to get into choice high schools, they need a portfolio and the ability to articulate their thoughts and passions. Most ELs don't have the guidance to do this.

The project addresses students, and educators through a tested, technology-driven approach that taps many known but underutilized findings and best practices, such as professional learning communities, student learning communities, combining cognitive, kinesthetic and affective experiences to inspire intrinsic motivation, inquiry-based learning, authentic use of English for real purposes, collaborative groups (e27-29) – formative assessment, apprentice model, portfolios, digital media literacy. (e30-33)

The magnitude of the gaps and weaknesses is demonstrated by many findings, none more gripping than that “nationwide, ELs enter high school unprepared to meet the academic demands they find there: in 2015, 70% of ELs scored Below Basic on the NAEP 8th Grade Reading Exam, and once they have course failures or very poor attendance in the middle grades, are very unlikely to graduate from high school.” (e21-22)

The argument made in this section of the proposal is compelling, weaving back and forth between challenges for students and educators, but always with a goal of serving ELs.

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

#### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project. In determining the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project, the Secretary considers the quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

(2) The likely impact of the services to be provided by the proposed project on the intended recipients of those services.

(3) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.

#### **Strengths:**

(1)

The project is an application of the DDLC model created by ArtsConnection, to address the gaps described above. The goal is “to build a shared knowledge base and the capacity of arts, ENL, and humanities educators to collaborate across disciplines in order to improve teaching practice and help middle school ELs learn to work and think like artists.” The DDLC model/tool has been developed through several grants, is built on robust research and well-respected best practice, with valid and reliable research that found the program effective. (e27-34)

There are parallel tracks for student and educator learning communities, with educators divided into ENL and humanities teachers who learn more about the arts and focus on authentic theater and dance experiences that require student engagement and language usage, and art teachers who learn more about formative assessment and driving portfolio creation and deepening inquiry in and through visual art. Teachers create portfolios and engage in inquiry along with students. The vehicle for this work is the DDLC digital tool (e27-28). Research support is found in each section from (e28-34), creating a compelling argument for the project.

(2)

The proposed project is likely to impact intended recipients because the need is so great, the solution simple (“provide middle school learners with iPads installed with ePortfolio templates that make their learning visible and engages them in documenting and reflecting on their art-making” (e34)), and the process (using peer and self, formative assessment as a cornerstone) is highly interactive and introspective while requiring collaboration. (e31-34)

Three clearly articulated objectives (Language Supports, Formative Assessment, and Technology) are described with participant action steps and some background information or supporting evidence (e39-47). Some particular strengths within this section:

Statements that indicate the applicants have had lots of experience with Federal and other grants, and are already working in NYC. (e41)

The formative assessment process, called the Creative Learning Loop that is intrinsic to the creative process, and will be taught to teaching artists if they are not already trained. (e41)

Students and teachers follow a sequential process of assimilating criteria for “good work” in portfolios, which provide students and teachers with visible evidence of learning, and where students construct meaning and teachers facilitate that learning. (e41-42)

Teachers and students will use a parallel digital portfolio process, which helps teachers understand how difficult it is for students to express their ideas verbally. This leads teachers to think about student learning and students in new ways. Teachers learning technology can be like EL students learning English.

Teachers who do not have permanent certification are required to take 100 hours of in-service training over 5 years, and this PD can be used toward that permanent certification. (e43)

Digital media skills are built sequentially over three years, with small working groups using iPads. Students learn vocabulary and conceptual language as they work together with specific feedback protocols and prompts. (e44)

There will be a robust social media space created for participating teachers to collaborate, share, and discuss. Sharing will also occur at an annual Conference Day.

(3)

The intensive framework of professional development, outlined on e37-39, is meticulously thought out and scaffolded to build student and educator skills and understandings over a 3-year period. Using both arts and CCSS-ELA standards (speaking and listening) as guides, the project will engage teachers in practitioner research centered on the inquiry

question, "How does the integration of language supports and formative assessment into arts instruction and the implementation of a collaborative ePortfolio process help ELs achieve arts and ELA standards?"

There are sufficient hours of PD contact, on-line courses, meetings, and Arts Learning Labs with either teaching artist residencies for ENL and humanities teachers, or visual arts specialists for art teachers. All teachers will compile portfolios of their action research, sharing at a conference (e38-39). Art teachers will also observe one another, followed by peer feedback sessions. (This process has already been piloted through another grant.) (e39)

There is an ongoing feedback loop that occurs at every level of the project. These are detailed on e47-48.

In Year 4, resources will be curated, edited and posted on a public-facing website that will make materials widely available. There is an aspiration to bring this process to the broader educational community, to inspire others to engage language learners in highly motivating and meaningful educational experiences that enrich lives, and to help students and teachers learn word languages including English. This process is detailed on e48-50.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 25**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel**

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**(1) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

**(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of project consultants or subcontractors.**

**Strengths:**

The key personnel are introduced on e50-56. This is a group of highly experienced and qualified professionals, each uniquely suited to her or his role, and also to collaboration. Most of the team knows one another and have successfully collaborated to implement prior grant projects.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

This criterion was thoroughly discussed and my score reflects my personal assessment of this section.

**Reader's Score: 15**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**(1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

**(2) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**

**(3) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.**

**Strengths:**

(1)

The management plan is more than adequate to achieve the objectives on time (the scope is tightly focused and manageable without being narrow).

There are clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for each objective. (e57-59)

Instructional resources are described for students, educators, arts learning, and a course for broader audience. (e59)

(2)

Feedback on effectiveness of the program will be on-going for continuous improvement, and the Project Team will be updated by the Project Evaluator quarterly.

(3)

The allocation of key personnel time commitments is adequate to meet the needs of the proposal.

The Project Co-Directors from the district and ArtsConnection will oversee the project, each spending 50% of their time managing.

ArtsConnection will actively manage the Digital DELLTA platform and professional development activities.

There are Program managers and an Educational Technology Manager, with time commitment equivalent to 125% of a full-time position.

The Project Evaluator will direct a team of graduate and post doc researchers from Columbia University. This team has worked together before, under Dr. Horowitz.

**Weaknesses:**

The budget and time information is lacking for a timeframe for collection and how they will complete it within budget.

**Reader's Score:** 19

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

(1) **The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.**

(2) **The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**

(3) **The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory (as defined in this notice).**

**Strengths:**

The project evaluation is robust and detailed. (e62-70)

It addresses the objectives that have been stated throughout the proposal, now stated with target goals for each year of the study.

There will be an "Impact Study with quasi-experimental design, and an Implementation Study, supplemented by a systematic mix-method investigation, with quantitative and qualitative approaches to data collection and analysis."

Each objective's methodology is described in detail, identifying the supporting research and specific tools, as well as data analysis processes.

Validity and reliability are stressed throughout, and pilot studies have been used on at least one of the measures.

The level of detail that has been applied throughout will strengthen the overall quality of the evaluation. For example, on e67: "All analyses will control for economic need."

(2)

Reporting is discussed on e69, and is thorough.

This team is well-known in the field, and has lots of experience doing this type of research with this type of program. They set a very high standard. Rich data will be mined for formative and summative findings that inform the project and the broader educational community, and particularly those working to help EL students be valued, engaged, and increasingly

able to participate in school, learning, the culture and their own lives.

(3)

The logic model on e74 provides a roadmap that reinforces and summarizes the plan with clarity and brevity.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant should provide additional information regarding feedback and how often it will be solicited/provided.

**Reader's Score:** 29

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Leveraging Technology**

**1. Projects that are designed to leverage technology through one or more of the following:**

**(a) Using high-speed Internet access and devices to increase students' and educators' access to high-quality accessible digital tools, assessments, and materials, particularly open educational resources.**

**(b) Implementing high-quality, accessible online courses, online learning communities, or online simulations, such as those for which educators could earn professional development credit or continuing education units through digital credentials based on demonstrated mastery of competencies and performance-based outcomes, instead of traditional time-based metrics.**

**Strengths:**

(a) & (b)

This project is all about technology, used not only as a tool, but as an inherent component of the learning process, to inspire 21st century skills that promote higher order thinking and creative problem solving for students and educators. The ePortfolio platform is used for student and educator professional growth, engagement, and for student language development. There may be some teacher language development as well, for those teachers who are not native English speakers.

Professional development is through a blended in-person and online training program.

There is a social network for teachers to share with and peer coach one another, and then to share achievement.

Technology provides storage for huge amounts of data, and gives a powerful voice to those who will learn to speak English words to describe their ideas and aspirations. In this proposal, technology has been imagined in a powerful application, and can open the door to learning.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 5

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 07/31/2017 12:25 PM